REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17 and 19-27 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicants note with appreciation that the following rejections have been withdrawn:

(1) rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph;

(2) rejection of Claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph;

(3) rejection of Claims 2, 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Yazaki et al (US 4,256,687);

(4) rejection of Claims 2-5 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Tsunashima et al (US 4,410,582);

(5) rejection of Claims 2-4 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Nagai et al (US 6,106,933);

(6) rejection of Claims 2, 3, 5, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Jacoby et al (US 5,310,584) in view of Fujimori et al (US 4,623,190); and

(7) rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yazaki et al and further in view of Osborn et al (US 3,852,237).

In Paragraph No. 8 of the Office Action, Claims 2-5, 12-15, 17, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsunashima et al and further in view of Osborn et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Tsunashima et al discloses a surface roughness of a surface layer of 3 to 20 μm to obtain a matted multi-layered polyolefin laminated film having finger-tearability in an arbitrary

direction and practical strength and is excellent in drawability and suitability for copying (col. 7, lines 20-25).

Tsunashima et al further discloses that if the surface roughness is below 3 μm, no matting effect can be obtained. Although drawability is improved, suitability for copying is lowered in that a corrected portion becomes remarkable when copied (col. 7, lines 27-35). In Example 7, the surface roughness of the film was 6 μm.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Tsunashima et al teaches away from using a surface layer having the surface roughness of less than 3 μm.

Osborn et al does not disclose or suggest the surface roughness of a surface layer of less than 3 μm.

In contrast, the present invention is directed to a thermoformed article having a surface roughness of not more than 2 μm.

In view of the above, even if there might be motivation to combine Tsunashima et al and Osborn et al, the combination will not result in the present invention. That is, the present invention is not obvious over Tsunashima et al in view of Osborn et al.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Fang Liu
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 2, 2004